

✓ 11/6/88

86 00027

REPORT  
FOR THE  
OAKLAND INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE  
ON  
ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFIC

prepared for  
THE CITY OF OAKLAND

BY

PACIFIC PLANNING ASSOCIATES

Oakland, California

December 3, 1984

Evelio Grillo, President



## INTRODUCTION

Responding to community concerns about street sales of drugs, and the crimes of violence associated with drugs, the City of Oakland has established drug traffic control as its number one priority. Mayor Lionel Wilson stated at a City Council work session on September 20, 1984:

"I'm concerned, and I know the Council is concerned about what drugs do to our community. Our young people, who should be our hope, are being lead into lawless lives and dependency on illegal and dangerous substances. The damage to the community is too great. Although we have done a great deal to stem drug sales, we have an obligation to our City to marshall every resource available, to commit ourselves to a new battle. We must look for new strategies, more effective approaches to prevent drug trafficking from taking over our street corners and putting our neighborhoods in fear."

As one step, the City of Oakland is conferring individually with officials of federal, state and county jurisdictions which have major roles in law enforcement and crime prevention in Oakland. The purposes of these individual conferences have been to determine:

- o what the various agencies consider the present situation to be with respect to drug traffic, particularly street sales and their attendant violence
- o how the close cooperation which presently exists among law enforcement agencies can be intensified
- o how to utilize more effectively resources presently available to counteract drug traffic





- o how to procure or enlist additional resources
- o how residents, neighborhood groups, and community organizations can be more effectively involved in efforts to discourage and prevent drug abuse and traffic in drugs
- o how to respond to the interest of the media in this cooperative effort.

Participants who have contributed their views include:

From Federal agencies:

- Drug Enforcement Administration, Joseph E. Krueger
- U.S. Probation and Parole, Doris Halliday-Cannata

From State agencies:

- Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement, S.C. Helsley
- California Youth Authority, Bill Lockwood & William Hayes
- Department of Corrections & Parole, Robert Roenicke
- California Youth Authority, Jack Gifford

From County level agencies:

- District Attorney's Office, John Meehan & Tom Ross
- County Probation, Paul Green

From City Agencies:

- City Manager, Henry Gardner
- Police Department, George T. Hart
- City Attorney, Richard Winnie

From the Courts:

- Superior, Stan Collis
- Municipal, George Dickey

The goal of this effort to intensify cooperation is to improve the provision of service by the several agencies which exercise enforcement responsibility and authority in Oakland. Each agency's effectiveness can be enhanced in proportion to the degree of its knowledge of the policies, procedures, programs, and personnel of its counterpart agencies. Further effective interagency cooperation leads to specific and concrete exchanges and sharing of resources between and among agencies. Such exchanging and sharing can lead to substantial service enhancement and improvement.





This report is based on the individual conferences. It reflects some of the observations of the participants who were interviewed. This report will serve as a discussion document for the second step in the process: a meeting of those who were interviewed to discuss intensified cooperation.

Each interview was preceded by the presentation of a draft discussion memorandum which provided background information about the Special Interagency Group Initiative and which listed the questions which would be asked during the interviews. The interviews were informal and general.

The questions which were asked are as follows:

1. What is the situation?
2. How are we doing as individual agencies?
3. How are we doing together?
4. What else could we do together? Should we try to achieve closer cooperation. If so, how?
5. How should citizens and community groups be approached?
6. How do we respond to media interest in this effort?

The broad objective of the individual visits was to determine how to intensify interagency cooperation among the different levels and jurisdictions of law enforcement.

The responses to the question, and particularly to the question with respect to interagency cooperation indicate a high degree of support for the notion of intensifying cooperation among law enforcement agencies.

Summaries of the discussions with each participant follow.





Summary of Comments by Joseph E. Krueger

Special Agent in Charge, Drug Enforcement Administration

Ninety percent of the illicit drugs consumed in this country come from abroad. Therefore, the Drug Enforcement Administration targets major resources on multijurisdictional efforts to deal with the issues of international supply. This perspective and strategy are different from that of the California Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement which focuses on domestic supply.


The supply and the demand side of traffic in drugs are intimately intertwined. The first line of defense is the local police department.

Resource allocation is a major problem in drug law enforcement. Concentration on street sales may not have the impact that focusing efforts on higher levels of drug suppliers can have. The community pressure for the focus on street sales must, nonetheless, have a response.

One effective way of fighting the drug traffic problem is to make the cost of doing business too high through such programs as the Asset Forfeiture Program.

On the demand side of the equation, some success is being met by parent groups organized to fight the drug abuse in their own neighborhoods and communities. Parents For Drug-Free Youth, for example, has been very effective. It has achieved substantial access to the White House and to Congress. This national organization might provide some help to the local community in its efforts to counteract illicit traffic in drugs.

This may be an especially auspicious time to deal with the drug traffic problem because of the passage of the new Crime Reform Bill. The legislation is sweeping. It is the toughest law to be enacted in the last twenty years. It provides financial resources which could be utilized by the City.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2024 with funding from  
State of California and California State Library

<https://archive.org/details/C124878754>

The relationship between the Oakland Police Department and the Drug Enforcement Administration is excellent. Each of the Administration's three task forces presently has a major case with Oakland.

Chief George Hart's perception that Oakland's situation with respect to drug traffic and drug abuse is not appreciably different from that of comparable cities throughout the nation is accurate. Oakland's problems are not unique. It is difficult, if not impossible, to sell the constituency and the media on this reality. Yet Oakland has a very positive story to tell and it should give thought to ways of capitalizing on its successes.

The Drug Enforcement Administration supports Oakland's efforts emphatically. Specifically, the Drug Enforcement Administration can provide direct support to Oakland's efforts to deal with traffic in illicit drugs a number of specific ways such as:

- deputizing of local police officers so that they can serve as U.S. marshals.
- deputizing district attorneys so that they can function as U.S. attorneys in situations wherein local cases may be dealt with as federal offenses;
  - \* with the Forfeiture Asset Program.
  - \* by procuring assistance from other divisions of the Justice Department, such as the F.B.I.

The CAMP Program is the prime example of cooperation across many jurisdictions to accomplish an important objective for the nation. Northern California has become the world's center for production of high grade marijuana. It was important to demonstrate to the world community that the United States was doing something about its position as the provider of the world's supply of high grade marijuana.

There is probably no overall media strategy or program that can be developed. Ultimately, each agency and jurisdiction is responsible for its own relationship with the media and for the information it provides about itself.





Summary of Comments by Doris Halliday-Cannata,  
Chief U.S. Probation Officer

The U.S. Probation Department views the experiences with respect to drug traffic in Oakland through its probationers and parolees. It currently has 495 cases under supervision throughout the Northern California coastal counties. 80 to 90 of these cases are greater Eastbay cases. Through a program of regular urinalysis the probation office tracks the use of drugs by its probationers and parolees. Since this program was begun in January 1984, 40 to 60 tests per month have disclosed the use of illicit drugs. The majority of the cases are located in the San Francisco, San Jose and Oakland areas. The drugs of preference for this group are heroin and cocaine.

The testing program is elaborate and it is part of a large program of contracted services including:

- o individual and family psychological services
- o physical health care
- o job training and job finding services
- o vocational rehabilitation.

Probationers or parolees are returned to halfway houses after two positive urinalyses. The frequency of their visits to probation officers is increased. An additional positive urinalysis leads to immediate revocation, or referral to the parole commissioner for revocation. The "no dope" posture of the agency is made very clear.

The testing program has led to a substantial increase in the violations rate. There are limitations on the Federal Probation Agency's flexibility to move in cases where parolees are involved in arrests for new offenses. Further, the probation or parole of offenders who are in custody pending trial cannot be revoked before there is a conviction. In cases wherein parolees or probationers are being adjudicated by Municipal courts, the Federal courts tend to wait until a determination is made at that level before action is





taken at the Federal level. However, in cases wherein drug use is indicated, the revocation can be accomplished more easily.

The Federal Probation Agency welcomes the opportunity to work more closely with the other law enforcement agencies. It especially welcomes the opportunity to interpret that it does not have the power to arrest and hold parolees, such as it has in the case of probationers. All of its actions changing the status of parolees must be upon recommendation to and order from the U.S. Parole Commissioner for the region.

The Federal probation and parole profile tends to be low at the local level. The opportunity to have its functions and programs understood more broadly is appreciated.

What Oakland is attempting is very positive, and it is possible to have the media interpret the developments favorably. The Federal Probation and Parole Agency wishes to participate in efforts to achieve closer cooperation among law enforcement agencies concerned with decreasing traffic in illicit drugs.



Summary of Comments of Robert Roenicke,  
District Manager, California State Department of Corrections,  
Probation and Parole Division

There has been a 100% increase in the caseload of the division in the last eighteen months. Over half of the number of offenders who go to prison have drug-related problems. The Department of Corrections' caseload is constituted entirely of parolees.

There is a "crossover" age group in the adult and youth parole systems which leads to some confusion. Youth and adults are held in different systems, and the legal processes in the two systems are different. Further, some offenders as old as 24 may be in the youth system, while many offenders younger than 22 are in the adult system.

The Department enjoys excellent relationships with local officials at both the City and County levels. Nonetheless, there is a clear need for greater understanding by each law agency of the responsibilities, functions, policies and procedures of its counterparts. There is a need for interagency training, especially at the line level. There should be frequent updates of the information each agency has about the others. Personal contacts are one of the most important tools in law enforcement and efforts to facilitate contacts between and among enforcement agencies tend to make them each more effective.

There is little understanding of the role of the Parole agency in the community. There is extensive confusion about the differences between probation and parole. It is not generally understood that parolees are returned to the communities where their offenses were committed. The belief is there is a need for broader understanding of reentry programs such as work furlough centers in Oakland. The Department receives a substantial number of understandable protests of such assistance to parolees, particularly from those who were victims of the offenses. There exists also a belief that treatment programs draw parolees. There is a law designed to prevent a city such as Oakland from becoming a "draw" for parolees under supervision.





It is helpful to understand that the media must pursue "news", and, therefore, that they are interested primarily in curious incidents and events. This approach tends to distort situations. It is important, therefore, that efforts such as that being mounted by the City of Oakland, "get out" to the media.





Summary of the Comments of S.C. Helsley,

Chief Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement

State Department of Justice

The California Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement efforts are focused on domestic sources of supply and their eradication. The states' first priority is financial investigation of suspected drug dealers and drug users. The State wants to break "the financial networks" in the drug world and in so doing it hopes to take the profits out of illegal activity. The state law provides for asset forfeiture.

Assets are forfeited when;

- o the defendant is convicted; or
- o if the defendant does not file a claim for the assets within 10 days of the arrest.

The law allows local jurisdictions to recover the expenses of prosecution. This money can be used for any criminal activity. After local jurisdictions recover their expenses the Department of Mental Health gets 50% of the balance for child primary care. The other 50% then goes to the local jurisdiction for drug law enforcement. Some drug enforcement agencies are opposed to the allocation of funds to the Department of Mental Health and are organizing to change this provision in the law. According to them the allocation of 50% of the dollar reduces law enforcement incentive with respect to asset forfeiture activity. The Department has developed a manual on asset forfeiture and is providing training with respect to the new law and with respect to effective approaches to asset forfeiture. The Department is concerned that since there are few precedents with respect to asset forfeiture, bad case law may be litigated if asset forfeiture activity is not carefully structured and monitored. There is currently a state committee which is addressing the issue of asset forfeiture including the issue of the allocation of assets. Jack Meehan from the County of Alameda sits on that committee.



The second priority of the Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement is the seizure of clandestine laboratories, both wholesale and retail operations. There is a strong connection to the first priority as there is considerable profit to be made from the production of drugs. Although the law is very strict with respect to record keeping on the purchase of chemicals, there are ways to escape detection including going out of state for the chemicals, new combinations of chemicals, and a few crooked chemical companies which complete County forms or even refuse to fill out forms required by the law. Furthermore, labs can be moved very easily. In Northern California the drug manufacturers are extremely well organized and are related to motor cycle gangs. Nevertheless, the State has developed a computerized system and other ways of tracking drug manufacturers. Also, the new law does not allow judges any choice as to sentencing with respect to convictions related to clandestine laboratories.

The third priority of the Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement is related to major multijurisdictional cases. As with clandestine laboratories, major multijurisdictional cases may have considerable financial and asset forfeiture implications. Such cases provide the State with a broad perspective as to the drug traffic problem, both the domestic and international.

The fourth priority of the Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement is training. Training is targeted internally as well as externally. Over 1000 individuals from local jurisdictions are trained every year.

In addition to these four priorities, the Bureau of Narcotics is involved extensively in discouraging the diversion of prescription drugs, the campaign against marijuana production, and it provides personnel and other support to local task forces in smaller, less populated counties. Diversion of prescription drugs represents 5% of the States caseload but consumes 10% of its resources because they are harder to prosecute. However, the State has established a computerized tracking system to trace the diversion of prescription drugs. The system is quite sophisticated as it identifies the doctors who write the prescriptions and the patients for whom the prescriptions are written.





The CAMP program is a model of cooperation among different jurisdictions of law enforcement. Many federal agencies cooperate, including the U.S. Forest Service. Many police and sheriffs departments from California send police officers to work on a temporary basis with the various CAMP teams. During 1984, 37 counties were involved in the CAMP program. The program has been a great success in terms of the number of plants and the amount of marijuana which has been eradicated. More importantly, it has been a media success, and therefore, the most effective vehicle for education of the public as to the size and seriousness of the drug traffic problem.

The State also provides personnel and technical assistance for smaller rural counties through the establishment of local task forces. These local task forces are considered appropriate in those situations in which there are few law enforcement officers and few resources for equipment and other activities. Such task forces are not considered appropriate for the larger urban settings.

The Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement recognizes a serious problem of coordination in the enforcement of laws related to drug law enforcement. From one perspective, it can be held that the enforcement of laws covering illicit drugs is managed by informants. It tends to be focused on targets of opportunity and largely it is reactive rather than proactive.

Attorney General Van de Kamp is strongly supportive of efforts to improve drug law enforcement at the local level by developing close cooperation among the various agencies and jurisdictions. The Bureau of Narcotics Enforcement enjoys a mutually supportive relationship with the Oakland Police Department and it stands ready to respond to the limit of its resources at its disposal to any invitation for participation or request for support. The Oakland effort is an interesting and laudable one and the Bureau and the Justice Department appreciates the opportunity to be a part of it.



## Summary of Comments of Stan Collis

Administrator, Superior Court of Alameda County

The Alameda County Superior Court is vitally interested in the City of Oakland's efforts to reduce drug traffic by developing closer cooperation among enforcement agencies. The Courts consider the sale of narcotics as very serious crimes, comparable to murder and rape because the citizen is directly the victim. The Court tends to key on those cases wherein the citizen will be harmed directly and personally.

Oakland has the highest homicide rate in Northern California. Homicide cases, particularly death penalty and life without possibility of parole consume a great proportion of the courts' time. The selection of a jury may take as long as three months and the trial itself may take as long or longer.

The courts seriously need increased resources to handle the substantially increased caseload. There is currently a backlog of 763 cases of which 60 are homicide cases.

The Courts have petitioned the Board of Supervisors to seek and provide for 3 new judgeships. The State Judicial Council recommended seven new judgeships for Alameda County. The State provides \$120,000 per annum to support each court, but the actual cost is approximately \$600,000. The County must provide the difference. Hence, it is not a certainty that the Board of Supervisors will approve the recommendation and request because the need for more courtrooms is balanced with other needs for services in the County. The Court will appreciate any support it receives in this effort to enlarge its capacity to handle the large caseload it faces.

The Alameda County Superior Court judges appreciate the invitation to participate in the Special Interagency meeting of December 3. Mr. Collis will attend the meeting as an observer for the Court.



Summary of Comments of Chief of Police George Hart and  
City Manager, Henry Gardner

Chief Hart:

It is a fact that Oakland faces serious problems with respect to drug traffic. Oakland is not unique, however. Oakland is dealing vigorously with this problem and within the past few months has intensified greatly its efforts to remove drug dealers from the streets. There is a belief that it is effective to pursue primarily "big" suppliers. In the eyes of the community the "little" suppliers are most visible and they contribute as greatly to the breakdown of families, of neighborhoods, and of the community. The community expresses great alarm whenever the sale of drugs seems open and unrestrained. The Police Department must respond to this understandable alarm and concern over the safety of the streets and neighborhoods.

Two programs have received extensive attention from the public and the media. One is "buy-bust" program and the other is the program whereby police, in effect, occupy sites which are considered to be "hot spots" with respect to the street sale of drugs and the violence which has attended it.

There is a clearly perceptible shift in the degree of support which police are receiving from the community in carrying out its law enforcement responsibility and mission. There also seems to be a "stiffening" of the Courts' attitude towards offenders convicted of selling drugs. The recent annual meeting of the Judges and Chiefs of Police was the most fruitful one yet.

Relationships with other enforcement agencies are extensive. Operationally, cooperative interactions take place on a daily basis. This effort to intensify multi-agency cooperation can yield substantial benefit to the community.

The outreach to the community is imperative. The help we are receiving from community leaders and groups is essential to the effectiveness of our efforts to suppress and discourage street traffic in drugs.





The approach to the media must be broadened and intensified. Oakland receives adverse media attention when it projects an image that it "doesn't have its act together." The positive and effective steps Oakland is taking and the progress Oakland is making are newsworthy, but we have not been too successful in making them news.

The community outreach strategy is of paramount importance. Prevention begins in the community, in the homes where residents live and the institutions of care and development such as the schools. Acts designed to prevent and correct must be built around those institutions. Our schools have been noticeably silent and absent. No strong new programs are being introduced to compliment what we are attempting to do from an enforcement perspective.

Finally, elected officials must be kept informed, involved, and active in any program designed to deter and discourage drug traffic. Perhaps, for example, each councilperson can be encouraged to hold hearings in his or her district.

City Manager Henry Gardner:

Extensive and effective efforts are being undertaken by the Oakland Police Department with the assistance and cooperation of its counterpart and cooperating agencies at the County, State, and Federal levels.

The aspect which needs equal if not more attention is our outreach to the community for understanding, support and direct involvement in our efforts. The public needs to know of our efforts. Residents need to be told what they can do in "do-able" terms.

We must communicate over and over that parents have a responsibility to monitor their children. Churches, community organizations, our total community must be involved on a continuing basis if we expect to keep or make our neighborhoods safe and wholesome.



## Summary of Comments of Paul Green

Chief Probation Officer, Alameda County

A recent survey of the workload of the Alameda County work load indicated a significant increase in the referrals it receives from the Courts. Data gathered yield the following comparison:

	<u>August 1983</u>	<u>August 1984</u>	<u>Increase</u>
Pre-sentence	109	140	22%
Diversion & Supervision	74	85	13%

The caseload of drug offenders increased from 1186 in 1982 to 2152 in 1983 (81%). The caseload will continue to increase, for the rate of referrals is still increasing.

The County's program of ongoing testing of probationers to determine if drugs are being used is inadequate. Testing should be carried out more frequently than once a month and its timing should not be predictable. At least \$200,000 more per year would be required for an effective testing program.

The Department files petitions for revocation of probation whenever a probationer is arrested for a new offense. The court can then proceed separately on the revocation petition.

There is an intensified concern in Oakland and in Alameda County regarding this increase in offenses involving drug use. Concurrently with the Oakland effort, the Task Force of County Officials at the staff level has been meeting to develop steps for increasing effectiveness of present operations and for seeking assistance from the Federal government such as was provided to Dade County in Florida. At the same time also Judge Winton McKibben, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of Alameda County has petitioned the Board of Supervisors seek three new judgeships for Alameda County to begin to serve in January 1986. Assemblyman Elihu Harris, Chairman of the Assembly Judiciary Committee has also been approached for assistance by Judge McKibben.

It is important that the courts be kept aware of what is being attempted. While the judges and their officers may find it appropriate to participate in planning of programs, the courts are





affected directly and immediately by policy and procedure changes instituted by enforcement agencies.

The cooperation which exists between the Probation Department and other agencies, particularly the Oakland Police Department is excellent. It is important and possible for all of the enforcement agencies to work even more closely together.

Keeping the public informed and involved are musts if an effective impact on the drug problem is sought. This requires more than a "one time" effort.

The increased public support now being perceived can be maintained if the residents who have come forward with support are kept abreast of what is being attempted and involved as participants in a community strategy. Various opportunities exist or can be developed to carry out these objectives. There exist in the County other efforts and programs designed to enhance interagency cooperation and to encourage community participation and support.

The Alameda County Probation Department supports the efforts being mounted by the City of Oakland.



Summary of interview with John J. Meehan

District Attorney, Alameda County

As is true of all crime, the most important element in any attempt to diminish, suppress or prevent traffic in illicit drugs is the community. The criminal justice system can address those who are directly involved in offenses. It can arrest, charge, prosecute, try, send to institutions, and supervise those placed on probation or parole. This addresses those who are directly involved in drug traffic.

What do we do, however, with a community and a society which have grown up tolerating drugs and traffic in drugs? How do we create an atmosphere which makes drug abuse and open traffic in illicit drugs unacceptable? That is a broad educational challenge and responsibility. It requires the combined efforts of all of the community's institutions working cooperatively.

The most important actors are citizens themselves. The community must make involvement in drug abuse and drug traffic socially unacceptable. It must be established that the detriment to the community will not be tolerated. Everything else we do is "band aid" treatment. Those involved in drug abuse and drug traffic are sending a message of acceptability to the larger community. The larger community in turn, must send a response that drug abuse and traffic are not acceptable.

Meanwhile, we must apprehend, correct, and punish the specific offenders. When it is made clear that those involved in illicit drug traffic face a very high probability of being arrested, charged, prosecuted, and sent to jail or prison, the message of unacceptability is communicated. There is evidence that when those involved in drug offenses expect to be dealt with strongly, firmly, and disapprovingly by the community and its institutions, traffic in drugs is discouraged. Stated in other terms, the atmosphere of unacceptability tends to inhibit participation in activity involving illicit drugs. This applies especially to marginal or fringe participants in activity involving illicit drugs.





A primary factor in establishing this atmosphere of unacceptability is the posture of the courts and the signals this posture sends out to the drug offender or prospective drug offender. In this respect there seems to be some shift towards a firmer, more disapproving approach by the Alameda County Courts. The "tone" seems to be changing. In the past, law enforcement officials complained and the judges were sympathetic, but crimes of violence were given higher priority by the courts than that given to drug offenses. The problem of "equal recognition" to drug offenses still exists, but drug offenses are being viewed more seriously than has been the case in the past.

There is clearly a problem involving the resources of the court. There is a pressing need for seven more judges, and an immediate need for three more. Meanwhile, nonetheless, it has helped for the courts to send out the message that they are "taking a hard look" at drug offenses. Revocations of parole and probation have increased. The process of sentencing the convicted has been enhanced. There seems to be an increasing willingness on the part of probationers and parolees and their defense attorneys to have new offenses adjudicated concurrently with the consideration of revocation.

This perceptible change in the climate with respect to drug activity is the result of public clamor. The big difference at present is in public support of enforcement activity. The press and the media have developed public awareness. The message is being communicated that what is happening in the community is not acceptable.

With respect to community involvement, it is very helpful to have the interest and concern of elected leaders continually communicated to the public. "City Hall" must continue to say, "we care, we can do something about the situation, we will do something about the situation." We must maintain the perception on the part of the community that effective action is being taken and all necessary and possible steps will be taken to suppress and inhibit traffic in drugs. Much more needs to be done and can be done. We are involved extensively with the schools. We need to be more deeply involved, still more deeply with schools and other agencies of education, care, and rehabilitation.



There is a perceptible enhancement of interagency cooperation. The new Forfeiture Of Assets Program is beginning to work well. Its potential for reducing the profits in drug traffic is tremendous. Exchanges of resources, and personnel between agencies and jurisdictions are increasing.

There are further approaches to improvement of the climate. The media are essential here. Rather than communicating simply that the situation is serious and difficult, we must help the media communicate that the "situation is serious and difficult and it won't be tolerated."

Oakland's increasingly assertive posture in handling drug offenses is having a positive effect throughout the County. While the focus of the media is on Oakland, there is a perceptible "spin off" of the effort elsewhere in Alameda County. The changed plea bargaining policy, for example, affects all offenders in Alameda County. The quicker recourse to revocation of parole or probation has a "rippling" effect in discouraging those on probation and parole throughout the county.

This effort to provide for closer cooperation among agencies in Oakland is important in and of itself. But it helps us in all our work with these agencies and with communities throughout the county. We are firmly committed to it.



Summary of Comments of Bill Lockwood, William Hayes & Staff,  
California Youth Authority

As befits its mission, the California Youth Authority has a primary concern with Youthful offenders. Its responsibilities lead it to look specifically to the juveniles who enter the criminal justice system.

One alternative in the effort to control and suppress drug traffic is that of sending youth involved in drug sales to the Youth Authority earlier than they are now being sent. There are few youths committed to the Youth Authority from Oakland and Alameda County as compared to the number which appears to be involved in drug offenses. There appears to be a belief that it is preferable to avoid state institutionalization until every other alternative has been exhausted. Valid and acceptable reasons may underly this attitude and posture among the committing authorities.

A clear result of this posture, however, is that youthful drug offenders assume that they will "get a second chance" if they are apprehended and found to have violated drug laws. Perhaps the Courts should be tougher with juvenile offenders, particularly with those involved as drug dealers. It may be considered that drug dealers do not need "a second chance" and that the community can ill afford to provide such a second chance. What the youthful offender and the community may need in both their interests is for the youthful offender to be placed under close, firm supervision as early as it becomes evident that he or she is involved in the selling or purchasing of drugs. Early and effective intervention is required at the beginning of the involvement in drug dealing if we expect to discourage and divert susceptible youth from careers in drug dealing.

This position incorporates the opinion that prevention and diversion result primarily from effective education, in homes, schools, and other institutions of care and development. It speaks to the reality that once involved as a drug dealer or purchaser, the youthful offender





requires very firm and consistent individual supervision and guidance if he or she is to be kept from more serious involvement in drug traffic.

The relationships between the Youth Authority and the Oakland Police Department are excellent. At the operational level, that is, when both agencies are involved with the same youth or youths, the interactions are frequent and effective. The Youth Authority believes that these relationships and interactions can be better if they could be more visible to youths and to the community. We can benefit substantially from intensified, more visible cooperation at the operational level, i.e. among parole agents and officers directly involved in apprehension, investigation, arrests, and referral to the district attorney or to the court.



Summary of Comments of George Dickey, Administrator Municipal Court and  
Thomas A. Ross, Assistant District Attorney

The present intensified community and governmental interest in curtailing traffic in drugs is the most encouraging development in twenty years. It appears that the community has been suffering for years and that it has "finally had it."

There is a perception that "law and order" have broken down at the neighborhood level. Residents seem concerned about what they see going on. An analogy can be drawn to past experience with street prostitution. Community concern led to increased support of firm and vigorous enforcement to discourage street prostitution.

There is an effort to procure more judges for the court. Increase in the number of judges is one important need. However, the provision of more judges in itself is only a partial answer. Effective programs will require the "shoring up" of all enforcement systems, the courts, the district attorney's office, probation, parole, and police activity.

The municipal court is clearly feeling the impact of increased enforcement activity. The pressure from the community to legislators has had a beneficial effect. Reaping the fullest benefit from the increased public support requires a coordinated effort among the different jurisdictions, agencies, and levels within jurisdictions and agencies.

Further, a fully effective program cannot be mounted with existing resources. While the Asset Forfeiture law and program may generate resources in the long term, in the short term effective policing of drug dealers will create expenses, in the form of need for more courts, more deputy district attorneys, more police overtime, more probation officers, more parole officers and the like. The easiest part of dealing with the complex problem may be the "buy" and the arrest.





Cooperation among agencies and jurisdiction may well involve first a consideration of an interagency group's ability to generate more resources and to plan for more effective allocation of existing resources.

Experience with past existing coordination and cooperation efforts indicates that they pay rich dividends in increased effectiveness. There is substantial potential for improvement of present operations and programs by exchange of information among the agencies regarding the impact of one agency on the others of agency:

- o missions and structures
- o policies
- o procedures
- o problems
- o plans.

A cogent example of this reality can be found in the present effort to secure more judges.

- a) Are these to be Superior court judges?  
How do we provide for the Municipal Court's ability to handle the increased court probation load?
- b) Out of the fifty cases in the last "sweep", one third were of youthful offenders. What are the implications for the juvenile court and the probation and parole systems?

The municipal judges are aware of the Oakland effort, and appreciate the invitation to participate. Mr. Dickey will attend the December 3 meeting as an observer for the Court.



## CONCLUSION

This paper summarizes the individual comments of all of the agency chiefs who have been visited on behalf of the City of Oakland. The purposes of the visits were:

- o to communicate formally the desire and intent of the City of Oakland to pursue assertively the objective of closer co-operation with all law enforcement agencies dealing with traffic in illicit drugs in the city;
- o to seek the view of those visited regarding traffic in illicit drugs in Oakland;
- o to canvass the opinions of agency chiefs regarding the desirability, the feasibility, and the possible ways of intensifying cooperation among and across the various agencies and jurisdictions.

Mayor Wilson, City Manager Gardner, and Chief of Police Hart appreciate deeply the response to this effort to extend the excellent cooperation which exists between and among the various agencies and jurisdictions. They are firm in the belief that intensified collaboration will yield significant benefits to the Oakland community and, therefore, to our county, our state, and our nation. Resources of the city will be dedicated to this important objective.

The specific hope is that out of the meeting will come a decision to establish a multi-agency program which provides for:

- o regular and ongoing exchange of current information regarding
  - agency missions and structures
  - policies
  - operations
  - problems
  - plans, both long range and short range



- o ongoing joint planning of operations which involve more than one agency;
- o mutual support, including, where appropriate, exchange of resources and sharing of resources;
- o where appropriate, joint approaches to the public.





OAKLAND INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE  
ON

ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFIC

DECEMBER 3, 1984

PROPOSAL

It is recommended that:

1. the agencies represented at this meeting form themselves into a group for the purpose of ongoing joint planning of measures designed to reduce traffic in illicit drugs in Oakland.
2. for the present, the group refer to itself simply as the OAKLAND INTERAGENCY GROUP ON DRUG TRAFFIC.
3. one of the two options set forth below be chosen as the structure for beginning the work of this group.

OPTION A

One group, constituted of the heads of the agencies is formed. In this option, the committee of agency chiefs, called the Executive Committee, will:

- develop and establish policies guiding interagency cooperation and coordination.
- guide operations which are planned jointly in the committee.

OPTION B

Two groups are formed.

- an Executive Committee, which will
  - \*\* develop and promulgate policy on interagency cooperation and
  - \*\* decide with respect to the measures the committee will undertake



- an Operations Committee, which will
  - \*\* develop policy recommendations for the Executive Committee and
  - \*\* guide the implementation of cooperation of coordination policy.

4. One of two options for future meetings be selected.

If a single level is organized, meetings will be held once a month.

If two levels are organized;

the Executive Committee to meet every two months.

the Operations Committee to meet once a month.

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C124878754